

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 9-19 and 21 are cancelled. Claims 1-8, 20 and 22-28 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is submitted with the present Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8, 20, and 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klug (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,327) in view of Bezos (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 1 and 20 have been amended to more clearly show the distinctions over the relied on sections of Klug and Bezos. Support for these changes is found, e.g., in Figs.9-11 and on pages 24-34 of the specification.

As an example, claim 1 calls for:

first transmitting means for transmitting the user identifier and the generation source identifier to the external apparatus to enable the external apparatus to record the user identifier and the generation source identifier as associated entries in a data base[.] (Emphasis added.)

The relied on sections of Klug and Bezos do not disclose or suggest transmitting a user identifier and a generation source identifier to the external apparatus, and the relied on sections of Klug and Bezos do not disclose or suggest recording the user identifier and the generation source identifier as associated entries in a data base.

Claim 1 further calls for:

second transmitting means for transmitting the user identifier and the generation source identifier to the terminal device to enable the terminal device to request access to the external apparatus by sending

the user identifier and the generation source identifier to the external apparatus and to enable the external apparatus to use the user identifier, the generation source identifier, and the data base to identify the terminal device as being introduced by said information processing apparatus. (Emphasis added.)

The relied on sections of Klug and Bezos do not disclose or suggest using the user identifier, the generation source identifier, and the data base to identify the terminal device as being introduced by said information processing apparatus.

It follows that, for at least these reasons, neither the relied on sections of Klug nor the relied on sections of Bezos, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the apparatus defined in claim 1, and claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Independent claim 20 defines features similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 1. Therefore claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Klug and Bezos for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1, and claims 22-28 depend from claim 20. Therefore, each of claims 2-8 and 22-28 is distinguishable over the relied on references at for the same reasons as its parent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in

order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant